The habitnal insolence of the abelitionists in Washington, imposes upon the Representatives of the South the necessity either of shameful submission to insult and obloquy, or of some apprepriate and adequate redress of their grievances. To relabiate in kind would be abborrent to all the manly instincts of Sonthern gentlemen, and would besides soon convert Congress into a brothel or abear garden, where the antagonism of opposing parties would be reduced to a contest of flithy vituperation. The abolitionist recognizes no responsibility on the field of honor for words of wanton or deliberate denunciation. What recourse, then, has the Southern gentleman? If he has not been abused in his own person, his State and his country have been traduced, and all the finer feetings of his heart trampled upon by a beast of an abolitionist. To endure such indignities would imply an absence of that sensibility to insult and of that fearless impulse of resentment which constitute the chivalry of the Southern character. The obligation to avenge any personal affront or libel upon his State is as keenly felt by the Southern gentleman as the duty of repelling the assault of a public enemy. This pride of personal inviolability, and this perfect readiness to confront death in vindication of his honor, impart to the character of the Southern gentleman the dignity and delicacy of sentiment which distinguish it from the habitual dispositions of any other community. With passions inflamed and pride hamiliated by an intolerable insult, by what mode of redress can be satisfy his wounded sensibility, except by the infliction of personal chastisement on his adversary?

There may be some persons who contest the necessity of such violence of resentment on the part of Southern representatives, on the ground of want of adequate provocation. This objection implies an atter ignorance of the habitual tone and temper of abolition speakers. The vile and ferocious passions of their vulgar constituency find full ulterance on the floor of Congress. For suc

of the most respectable persons who witnessed the affair.

By the concurrent statements of these gentlemen, it is incontestibly proved that Sumner was duly warned of the hostile purpose of Mr. Brocks, and that he had risen from his seat before he was stricken a single blow. It appears, besides, that he did not receive more than a dozen blows in all, and that as soon as he fell Mr. Brocks ceased the castigation. Neither is there any dispute among the witnesses as to the conduct of Sumner. He offered not the least demonstration of fight, but only attempted to ward off the blows. It is not denied by first friends that he uttered piteous cries of distress, instead of exhibiting some effort, no matter how feeble, to resent the outrage upon his person.

Mr. Brocks' coolness and courage, as attested by all the witnesses, present the most striking contrast to cowardice of the craven-hearted wretch from Massachusetts. Throughout the affair his conduct was characterized by equal spirit and delicacy of sentiment.

The testimony of Sumner's physician confirms the

enaracterized by equal spirit and delicacy of sentiment.

The testimony of Sumner's physician confirms the popular suspicion that the fellow is feigning an illness which he does not really suffer. It is manifest that his hurt is not at all serious, and that he might have resumed his seat in the Senate the next day if he had not been utterly prostrated and unmanned by fright. Yet the New York Tribune of Wednesday gravely speaks of Sumner's being beaten to death in the Senate chamber.

There is no circumstance of this affair which so mortifies and humiliates respectable people as the conduct of Edward Everett. What sacrilege to associate the sufferings of Sumner with the memory of Washington!—to preface a eulogy on the Father of his Country with a whining cry of sympathy with an infamous traitor! It is just like Edward Everett. He has no superior support of the moment. His hatred of Sumner is motorious; yet he pretends to weep over the misformotorious; yet he pretends to weep over the misfor-tunes and to partake the indignation of the beaten abolitionist. And to think that all this hypocrisy is abontionist. And to think that all this hypocrisy is attached as an exordium to a eulogy on the character of George Washington! The tongue that can atter a wail over the prostrate body of an infamous abolitionist, is not worthy to name the name of George Washington. Mr. Everett should accept the George Washington. Mr. Everett should accept the effer of the professional rhetorician, and henceforth have his polished periods declaimed by a substitute. He is unfit to speak in the name of the ladies of Virginia, and we trust the managers of the Mount Vernon enterprise will dispense with his services. Everett a mourner at Sumner's fictitious funeral! In the end the most pompous plausibilities will be stripped of their disguise, and exposed to the contempt and ridicule of the world.

[From the same paper, June 9.]

SUMNER SUMPATHIZERS.

It is idle to talk of union, or peace, or truce with
Summer or Summer's friends. Catiline was purity itself compared to the Massachusetts Senator, and his
friends are no better than he. They are all (we mean friends are no better than he. They are all (we mean the leading and conspicuous ones) avowed and active traitors. The sending the Congressional committee to Kansas was done with the treasonable purpose of aiding the rebellion in that Territory. The black re-publicans in Congress are at open war with govern-ment, and, like their allies, the Garrisonian aboli-tionists, equally at war with religion, female vir-tue, private property, and distinction of race. They all deserve the halter, and it is vain and idle to in-dulge the expectation that there can be union or peace with such men. Sumner and Sumner's friends must be punished and silenced. Govern-ment, which cannot suppress such crimes as theirs, friends must be punished and silenced. Government, which cannot suppress such crimes as theirs, has failed of its purpose. Either such wretches must be hung or put in the penitentiary, or the South should prepare at once to quit the Union. We would not jeopard the religion and morality of the South to save a union that had failed for every useful purpose. Let us tell the North at once, "if you cannot suppress the treasonable action, and silence the foul, licentious and infidel propagandism of such men as Stephen Pearle Andrews, Wendell Phillips, Beecher, Garrison, Summer and their negro and female associates, let us part in peace. We would like to see modesty, female virtue, common morality and religion independent of government. The experiment at the South to leave these matters to the regulation of public opinion, works admirably. We are the most moral, religious, contented and law abdding people on earth, and are daily becoming more se.

coming more ss.

The reverse of all this is, for the time, at least, tree at the North. If you cannot expel the black republicans from power, punish them and silence them for the future, you are incapable of self-gevennrepublicans from power, punish them and silence them for the future, you are incapable of self-gevernment. You should adopt a military despecters. We adhere to our republican institutions. Your sympathy for Somner has shaken our confidence in your capacity for self government more than all your past history, full of evil portents as that has been. He had just avowed his complicity in designs far more diabolical than those of Cathine or Cethegus, nay, transcending in iniquity all that the genius of a Milton had attributed to his fallen angels. We are not surprised that he should be hailed as hero and saint, for his proposed war on everything sacred and divine by that Pandemonium where the blasphemous Garrison, and Parker, and Andrews, with their runnway negroes and masculine women congregate. He belongs to that crew himself. He is a proper saint for a free love saloon, or an infidel convention. But unless there be enough of patriotism, religion and morality at the North to express general detestation of his crimes and congratulations at his merited castigation, we had better part company. No evil that can beful the South would be so great as association with Sumner and Sumper's sympathizers.

[From the Washington Seutinel, June 7.]

[From the Washington Seutine], June 7.]

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

In a speech delivered by Mr. Sumner in open Senate, he took occasion in no less than one hundred and ninety passages of his speech, to give utterance to offensive and insulting language which were each and all violations of the "freedom of debate," as expounded by John Quincy Adams, as understood by Webster, by Calhoun, by Everett, by Fillmore, by Winthrop, by Hamilton, Jefferson, and by all parliamentarians.

That the speech was intended as personal and of fensive, that Mr. Sumner was a long time, and care ful, in preparing it, to give to it the extremest bitterness of personal offence, that he, in advance, gloated over the irritation it must inevitably occasion, is

ever the irritation it must inevitably occasion, is beyond contradiction. For an ong other evidence

he addressed a letter to that political Gabriel, the "Rev, Theodore Parker," in which he stated that he had prepared such a philippic as had never been uttered in the Senate. And truly be was as good as his word. And we will add, such a one as we hope will never again be uttered in Congress or anywhere else, by anyone having pret. nsion to respectability.

Is not the vanity of Mr. Sumner transparent in this matter? His blind vanity in seeking the approval and commendation of Theodore Parker, and similar lunatics, renders him oblivious of the outrage he is about to perpetrate on the Senate, on the State which sent him, and on the country, by exhibiting to the world a Senator arrogating to himself the supremacy of scholarship in that body, as a common libeller and slanderer. He himself calls it a "philippic"—that is, a speech against one man, against Senator Butier, as being, like Philip, false and traitorous to the republic. Mr. Sumner, in his letter, does not pride himself upon the discussion of great constitutional questions, nor any question affecting the interests of the nation, or of Massachusetts, nor indeed of any measure whatever. It was a "philippic," and nothing but a "philippic." The Kansas question was a mere vehicle by which to bring this long and dearly nursed "philippic." The Kansas question was a mere vehicle by which to discharge his one hundred and ninety arrows.

The whole speech, by his own avowal, was a piece of pure malevolent vanity, laboriously concocted, not for the good of the nation, not to command the respect of good men at home, but as an offering to Theodore Parker, the high priest of avowed disunion—the denunciator of the constitution, the exciter of civil and of servile war—to obtain the admiration of this man and of his compeers.

Mr. Sumner would never have addressed such a letter to Webster, Everett, Choate, Appleton, Eliot, or Winthrop, expecting by such means to win their high approval and admiration. He knew his man. The speech was for consumption by Theodore Parker—et id ow

in similar outrages, and to their immunity in so doing.

Some fat the North propose that for the future the question for a Northern candidate shall be:—
Can you fight? Will you fight? This, of course, looks to a repetition of the offence, and a resistance to the consequent punishment.

One paper, the Courier and Enquiaer of New York, proposes to send Tom Hyer as a fit delegate. He doubtless would be a fit representative for the redoubtable editor of that paper, "Whose slanderous columns have not left him two good legs to stand upon."

He doubtiess would be a fit representative for the redoubtable editor of that paper, "Whose slanderous colma ne have not left him two good legs to stand upon."

We have his idea how to remedy such occurrences as that between Brooks and Sumner. It never occurred to his simple mind, that by sending Websters, Everetts, Choates, Woods, Fillmores, Havens, and such men, that the dignity of Congress would be preserved, the "freedom of debate" remain unviolated, and argument and fact assume the place of personal alanders and affronts. No, the more appropriate character for his representative would be a Tom Hyer, who would first use the language of insult of a Sumner and then add the violence of personal assault.

We submit, however, to the Lords, and other respectable men of the North, if this transaction should not be stripped of all the false issues made, and judged upon its naked merits?

This being done, can any do aught but give unqualified condemnation of Mr. Sumner?

[From the L'adiville Journal, June 6.]

THE SUMMER AND BROOKS APPAIR.

We regret to see that a very great portion of the press in both sections is pandering to violent sectional prejudices, and, by the most incendiary publications in regard to the Sumner and Brooks affair, is endeavoring to excite to a still greater degree of fury the mad fanaticism that is driving the Union into imminent danger of speedy dissolution.

The free soil press of the North and the Sag-Nicht newspapers in the South seem determined to make heroes and champions of Sumner and Brooks in their respective sections. It has been stated by many Northern newspapers that the whole Southern press, without exception, endorses and commends the outrageous c nduct of Brooks. This is not the case, and a sum and the sagner and some few of the more respectable democratic papers in the South, severely censure the conduct of Brooks, and at the assault upon one of its members than the assertion of its own dignity, to take your action in the premises. For any man to go into the Senate and make

[From the Charlottesville (Va.) Advocate—American.]
Mr. Brooks should have resented an insult to his

anche elsewhere than in the capitol of the country, and in a manner that would have afforded Mr. Sumfer some chance of fair play. To assault most violently with a cane a man whilst seated at his desk engaged in writing, and who has not had time to place himself face to face with his opponent, does not consist with our ideas of that chivalrous bearing and fair play which brave men would resort to in the windication of their honor. \*

We feel that, unless driven to it by the taunt and insults of the North, the South with general accord will condemn the manner and place of the attack made by Mr. Brooks upon Charles Sumner. For the dignity of the federal Union, and lest the act may reflect upon the people of the South, we are indeed mortified that a scene so unusual and conducted so reprehensibly should have been gotten up by a Representative in Congress from a Southern State. We do, therefore, deem it our duty to express our condemnation of the manner and place in which Mr. Brooks has sought to resent a personal afforat.

(From the Meble Adv. tister—American.)

Of course it would not be just to indge of the affair by the imperfect account received; but, if the telegraph speaks correctly, it will be very difficult indeed to find anyapology, much less any justification, or the deed. It is a shock to every man's sense of right and propriety to think of the Senate chamber being deliberately invaded for such a purpose, and a Senator in his seat subjected to such ignominious and hostile treatment, and we sincerely hope the reports may prove to have been much exaggerated if not wholly unfounded.

[From the St. tools intelligencer—American.]

We have never noted a more general and deep feeling of disapprobation than is, expressed by our exchanges from all sections of the country in regard to the cowardly and brutal, and the offence was—the act was cowardly and brutal, and the offence was—the act was cowardly and brutal, and the offence was—the act was consensed by Mr. Brooks, of South Carolina. We care not what the offenc

nity of the Senate, and preclude the repetition of a similar offense.

(From the Baltimore American—American)

Opinion is unanimous against the South Carolina member for making the SenateIchamber the theatre of so ruffinnly an outrage. The entire community look upon the occurrence as an outrage of so belinous a character as to require of the House of Representatives, for the preservation of its dignity, the prompt expulsion from that body of Mr. Brooks, of South Carolina. Nothing short of this will satisfy the nation.

ion.

[From the Baltimore Sun—Neutral.]

It is seldom, perhaps, that a more general feeling of disapprobation has been felt and expressed in regard to a circumstance of the kind, than is called forth on all hands by the outrage and deserration committed by the Hon. Mr. Brooks, of South Caroli-

na, in his violent assault upon Senator Summer, in the Senate chamber, on Thursday last.

[From the Bopkinsville Patriot—America.]

And has it come to this, that on the arena where the intellects of Webster, Calhoun, Clay and Randolph once grappled for the mastery with the strength of giants, a crew of puglists are henceforth to exhibit their build og ferocity? Instead of being raviabed with the eloquence of Marshall, Choate and Everett, must we had to have a bound the most scientific boxer, or who handred his pistols and bowie knife with the greatest dexterity? If so, then "farewell, a long lanewell to all the greatness" which we used to dream was the destiny of our republic. A people who tolerate such outrages cannot long be free; they do not deserve to be free: they are ignorant of the first principles and essentials of freedom. Like representatives like people, and if ruffianism be the character of the first, much more may we expect it in the latter. The constituents of Herbert and Brooks should bid them resign without delay; the House that they have disgraced should promptly expelthem.

[From the Memphis Bulletis—Old line Whig.]

latter. The constituents of Herbert and Brooks should bid them resign without delay; the House that they have disgraced should promptly expel them.

[From 'he Memphis Bulletin—Old line Whig.]

Sumner, although a low, grovelling, wicked demagegue, whose character stinks in the nostrils of all national men, North as well as South, is, by this outrageous and indecent indulgence of passion by a Southern representative, lifted up into the respectability of general sympathy. He has been made, not by his own acts, but by the foolish rage of a Southern man, a martyr in the popular mind to freedom of speech in the Benate. His assailant, by this headlong felly, has deepened and strengthened the belief created by demagogues in the Northern mind, that the South relies upon blackguard bullyism more than upon reason and argument, and has thereby swelled the ranks of the black republican party thousands upon thousands. It was an outrage upon the dignity and decorum of the Senate chamber, for which there can be no excuse or justification. It was a departure from the just self respect which Southern men, speaking, as we believe, the sentiments of Southern men, we repudiate and condemn this assault as wholly inexcussable upon any grounds whatever, and as an offence against our system of government which would not be too severely punished by the expulsion of its perpetrator.

[From the Balt'more Cipper—American.]

If he (Sumner) gave offence to certain members of the Senate or of the House, in his speech, it was only in the track of others who had indulged in like personality. The assault upon him by Mr. Brooks was wanton and unjustifiable, and was certainly not anticipated, as he was unprepared for any defence. If it shall ever become the established right of any member of either house of Congress to resort to the bludgeon for words spoken in the course of debate, the liberties of the people of this country will be in a fair way to be destroyed. None but bullies and blackguards will become our representatives; and measures will

Theatrical, Musical, &c.

BROADWAY THEATRE—More. Ponisi, an established favorite with the New York public, presents her claims for a benefit this evening. The fair beneficiary is to essay the character of Peg Woffington in the popular play of "Masks and Faces." a part in which she will have ample scope for the display of her acknowledged histrionic talent. She likewise personates Sir Edward Ardent, in the comedietta of "A Morning Call"—Mrs. T. S. Nims enacting the part of Mrs. Chillington. Mr. T. S. Nims also appears for this occasion as Christopher Strap, in the farce called the "Pleasant Neighbor." NIBLO'S GARDEN.—The new pantomime written by M. Jerome Ravel, called "Pongo, the Intelligent Ape," is one of the most pleasing pieces from the prolific pen of that popular author. It is a complete compound of fun and sentiment—at one moment the audience are convulsed with merriment at the whimsicalities displayed by Pongo, and the next minute they are seriously pondering over his misfortures. Marzetti has made a great hit in his new part, and the piece will unquestionably have a lengthy run. The Ravels Mile Robert and the ballet corps also appear in "Les Willis," and young Hengler and suite perform on the tight rope to night. Bowery Theatre—Miss Susan Denin and Mr. G. J. Arnold appear to have most aggreeably surprised the frequenters of this house by their superior delineation of the leading characters in the exciting drama called "Camille." They are seconded by the principal talent of the company, who seem to have taken unusual pains to render their various parts in unexceptionable style. "Camille" is to be repeated this evening, and as Miss Denin and Mr. Arnold are only engaged for a limited period, those who desire to see them in this drama should not defer so doing. Another great drama, "Jane Eyre," is also to be performed to-night.

Arnold are only engaged for a limited period, those who desire to see them in this drama should not defer so doing. Another great drama, "Jane Eyre," is also to be performed to-night.

WALLACK'S THEATRE.—This establishment is to close this evening with the benefit of Mr. J. W. Lester, the stage manager, and deservedly one of the day. Mr. Wallack has consented to appear on this occasion as Adam Brock, in the comedy of "Charles XII." The entertainments close with the excellent comedy called "Tit for Tat," in which Mr. Lester plays his original character of Frederick Thornby. The casts embrace the entire talent of the company, and, rain or shine, the house will be crowded. The box book was full two days ago; consequently those who desire seats must get into the parquette as early as possible.

LAURA KEENE'S VARIETIES.—Miss Keene will gratify her numerous patrons this evening with her universally admired delineation of the character of the renowned Peg Woffington, as so strikingly depicted in the comedy denominated "Masks and Faces." Among others who will perform in the piece are Misses Reignolds and Walters, Mrs. Carpenter, Messrs. Jordan, Loveday, Johnston and Wemyss, all artists of established reputation in their various lines of business. The play will be followed by the laughable farce styled the "Married Rake." The Varieties being one of the best ventilated and handsomest theatres in the country, the foregoing attractions cannot fail to fill it.

BROADWAY VARIETIES.—Go when you will it is generally found somewhat difficult to find a spare seat in this snug little theatre, and, what is better, the audiences, mostly composed of ladies and children, always express the highest gratification with the entertainments afforded by those wonderful miniature artists, the Wood and Marsh juvenile comedians. Little Mary, Louise, Carrie and others, particularly that perform two of their best pieces—"The Toodles" and "Pillicoddy."

EMPIRE HALL.—As was anticipated, M. Keller's new tableaus have taken artists and connoissed ho

loubtless bear in mind that she is to give her fare-well concert at Nibl'os Saloon this evening. Mr. Gottschalk, the distinguished planist, and other

Gottschalk, the distinguished planist, and other emixent artists assist.

Academy Hall.—Messrs. Conway, Brevort, Tyrone and Goodall, Mesdames Allen and Mathews, Misses Telbin and Charles, and various other performers, have volunteered for the benefit of Mr. J. G. Booth, which is to take place this evening. The selections consist of Shakspere's play of the "Merchant of Venice," the farce cathed "The Irish Lion," and a whinnical sketch styled "Miles's Son." As most of the artists have amumerable friends, the beneficiary may confidently rely on having a large andience.

BUNKER HILL.—This is the last week of the exhibition of the great historical diorama of the "Battle of Bunker Hill and Conflagration of Charlestown," at Buckley's Hall, Chinese Buildings.

DUSSELDERY GALLERY.—The merits of the extensive coffection of pictures in this gallery are too well known by our citizens generally to require comment—strangers, however, are notified that they can spend a couple of hours most agreeably at 497 Broadway.

CONCERT.—Signor Amodio has issued a splendid bill for a concert at Niblo's Saloon next Friday. He is to be assisted by a number of the finest artists on

is to be assested by a number of the linest artists on the occasion.

The London Times of May 19 says:—"Lucrezia Borgia" was presented on Saturday in a style of excellence that left nothing to criticise, and raised the enthusiasm of a crowded house. Mario and Ronconi entirely recovered, and Grisi, who, never ill-disposed, was better disposed than ever, gave an ectat to the performance which constituted it the most brilliant of the season. Mario has seldom displayed more energy and zeal. He seemed deter-

by the fear or favor of any one; it was about this time that lexpressed to Mrs. Pariah a desire that the would court; I said to Mrs. Pariah that all things were going on well at the office, except that he could not collect the interest on some stocks without a special power of attorney; she remarked in words, 'Oh, that is of no comequence,' she then inquired in reference to these stocks, if they were all in his trunk; I told her they were; she she me int I had the key of that tunk with me; I told her no; she asked me where I kep it; I told her in my private drawer at the office; she said. "If should ask you for it, would you have any objection in giving it up to me?" I told her I me sfleet, the exact words in that trunk, documents and so forth, which were negotiable without any one endorsement and I felt that. I could not give it up, for should any of that property be missing, I should be looked to for it; I thint she then made this remark, "Well, it is very hard that sman can't have his own,?" I said to her, "Whenever I am satisfied Mr. Parish is of sound mind, I shall have no objection in giving it up to him," during this interview, and holieve subsequent to the foregoing events—I think it was immediately afterwards—Mrs. Parish and, "I am sorry there is so much contention about his property before the man is clead." I replied that I had never heard to what time I would be allowed to see Mr. Parish, she said, "As to that you must take your chance with others, for so long as he remains in his present position, no one can see him." Tases I believe to be tearly her exact words; I then left; shortly afterwards, I think it was on the ninth of October, I went up to Mr. Parish, she said, "As to that you must take your chance with others, for so long as he remains in his present position, no one can see him." Traese I believe to be tearly her exact words; I then left; in The Mrs. Parish were the come up with him, or go up with him, the snew of many contention." The said was the many contention." The new parish the nev

sour reconsection, to get them back? A. I think there were some alabams bonds, Tennessee bonds, and Concinnati 5 per cent bonds, I think, and no one others, I think; about the latter part of April, 1800, think, at the per concentration of the content of the con

word to most for the disappointment of which has been compared of her compared on the compared of her compared on the compared of her compared on the compared mean that his hand, if it ever directed the pen which made it, was controlled by a mind other than his own. Q. Did you make that out from the handwriting of the signature or the signature? A From the handwriting of the signature or the signature? A From the handwriting of the signature or the signature from the signature or integrated or judged that it was not a voluntary signature? A. From its distorted appearance and from ideas I had of his incapacity for doing such things. Q. On what were these ideas founded? A. Taey were founded upon my knowledge from general conversation of the effects of paralysis, and the recent date of its occarrence with Mr. Parish? Q. Have you given, as nearly as you can, the words in which this information had been conveyed to you? A to the best of my memory I have. Q. Have you mentioned as distinctly as you can the person or persons from whom you received this information? A. I think I have, a Q. Did you at any time hold a power of attorney from Mr. Henry Parish? A. I think I have; a special power of attorney for a specific object; I don't remember the time; it was to carry out a specific object during some temporary absence, so I think. Q. Other than that, you never held any power of attorney from Mr. Parish. A. I have not, to the best of my memory. Q. Without reference to the question whether the signature for the order for the trunk you have mentioned, was voluntary or involuntary, did you at the time believe that it was made by Heary Parish? A. I do not recollect that I formed a very definite opinion upon the subject. Q. Did you show that order to any person other than Cashier Ogden? A. I do not remember the fact of my doing so; to the best of my recollection, I did not. Q. When Mr. Ogden said he would send up the trunk on that order, what made you intervene and take it up yoursel? A. Because in thating it up myself, I was very certain I should bring it back; grow out of? A. Because I had no idea of being satished that Mr. Parish was determined to get possession of it, and would

Russian Winters.—Professor Von Seidlitz, of the University of Dorpat, lately delivered a most interesting lecture on the subject of the breaking up of the ice and the close of the navigation in the principal rivers in the Russian empire, from which it appears that, though the periods of the first frost ore subject to such great fluctuations, yet the breaking up of the ice in the Dwina, Neva, Bialaja, Duna, Dnieper, Dniester, Boug and Wolga, is ascertained by the experience of 60 years, to vary enly four days, happening between the 24th and 27th of July (old style) every year. 2. As the maximum heat of the daily temperature rises at the astronomical noon, and the maximum of the annual temperature is governed by the summer solstice, so the average period of the above rivers remaining free from ice is in proportion to the difference of the periods of the above rivers memaining is in exact proportion to each other respectives. maximum of the mean annual temperature. 3. The difference of the periods of the above rivers memaining is in exact proportion to each other respectively, as the difference in the mean annual temperature at the respective places of observation. For every degree (Reaumur) of difference in the mean temperature of the year there is a difference of eighteen days in the duration of the open water. 4. The breaking of the ice in the Neva is subject to an ellipsoidal cycle of seventy years, the minimum of which ellipsis occurs in the years 1668, 1738, 1808, 1878, &c. The learned professor adds that it is not impossible that the truth of these observations may also be applicable to the rivers of other countries similarly blocked up with ice periodically.